

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of December 6, 2005, in which claims 1-19 were rejected. In reviewing the overall Office Action, the Examiner has made a novelty rejection of claims 1-15, but merely an obviousness rejection of claims 16-19 which introduce the further limitation to each of the respective independent claims that the rotational movements include left and right rotational movements (further limiting claim 1), that the changing direction includes left and right changes in direction (further limiting claim 10), and that the different directions-of-view include different left and right directions-of-view (further limiting claims 8 and 9).

From this, and the novelty rejection, it can be concluded that the Examiner is rejecting the independent claims 1 and 8-10 based on a perception that there is vertical movement disclosed by Park (U.S. 5,695,406). From the novelty rejection it can be seen that the "moveable headrest" pointed to by the Examiner comprises the immersion display hood 16 with headrest 24 shaped to contour the back of the subject's neck and head, and to support the head at a comfortable angle. The Examiner concedes that the headrest 24 is rigidly attached to the relaxation base 12. From Park, it can be determined at column 6, lines 50-54 that this permits a relaxed look-ahead mode promoting subject relaxation and cyberspace immersion.

Evidently, the Examiner is reading the movements of the relaxation base 12 as providing the "rotation movements".

However, independent claim 1 states that the moveable headrest mounted on or with respect to the support is for moving with rotational movements. The proper interpretation of this limitation is that it is the moveable headrest that is moving with

rotational movements. The claim specifically states that it is the headrest that is moving.

Since this action is nonfinal and there is still an opportunity to amend, Applicant has made the above amendment in order to make this even clearer in each of the independent claims. Thus, it will now be clearly understood from all of the independent claims that the movement of the headrest is with respect to the support.

As pointed out by the Examiner, the headrest 24 of Park is rigidly attached to the relaxation base and is not capable of moving with respect to the relaxation base.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 1-15 is requested.

* * *

Regarding the obviousness rejection of claims 16-19, the above amendment to the independent claims from which they depend has obviated the novelty rejection upon which this obviousness rejection is founded. At least for that reason, the obviousness rejection is no longer applicable and withdrawal thereof is requested.

It also remains true that there is no motivation to combine the Helman reference with the Park reference found in either Park or Helman. As pointed out by the Examiner, Park shows a rigidly attached headrest to the relaxation base and there is no hint or suggestion in Park to use a moveable headrest that moves with respect to the relaxation base. Similarly, Helman has to do with a wheelchair application for assisting a disabled person it does not have anything with displays or the display art in connection with immersion display hoods used in cyberspace environment.

Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 16-19 is requested.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of December 6, 2005, having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1-19 to issue is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Francis J. Maguire". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large loop at the end.

Francis J. Maguire
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 31,391

FJM/djc
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, PO Box 224
Monroe CT 06468
(203) 261-1234